

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/881,670	Applicant(s) MATSUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Luz L. Alejandro	Art Unit 1763	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Luz L. Alejandro. (3)_____.

(2) Michael Monaco. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 19 February 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: it was agreed that there is no record of receiving the response filed on October 29, 2003. The response will be refiled together with the filing receipts. The amendment attached with the response amended the claims to recite that at least one of the coils is disposed in a plane parallel to the plane of the other coil. It appears that none of the reference disclose coils in parallel planes, however, the examiner will need to further review the prior art of record and further search may be necessary. Applicant will considered further amending the claims to more closely correspond to fig. 8 .